



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

TENDENCIES OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDY.

IN the preceding number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, the books which were noticed under the above heading were treated as examples of the kind of work which is carried on year by year in the study of the Old Testament. They were regarded as typical of the gradual progress of Biblical studies which builds upon the foundations laid by former generations and endeavours "to make that better which they left so good." The justice of this criticism of the Old Testament was taken for granted, and it was assumed that even those who have no sympathy with this department of research would at least acknowledge that its exponents were not guilty of unworthy motives. But the recent publication of a little book by Dr. Emil Reich is a rude awakening. It is a particularly unpleasant specimen of uncritical criticism and intemperate attack directed against a method of research which its author describes as being both bankrupt and pernicious. *The Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Bible*¹ is not a serious attempt to refute the study, but an outburst of immoderate language, false imputation, and groundless fabrication. The writer thereof has made so slight an acquaintance with the critical literature that he believes that the Judæan or Yahwist series of writings belong to a "supposed chronicler in Jerusalem, 1400 or 1200 B.C." (p. 62), that critics hold it proved that "Christianity and Judaism are nothing but cribs of what the Babylonians long before possessed," and that "many of the Higher Critics . . . have even gone so far as to deny the existence of Israelite history" (p. 14). That such utter confusion can exist in the mind of a writer who claims a hearing is scarcely intelligible, but is quite on a line with his diatribes against philology, his conviction of the poverty of the Hebrew language, on the authority of—Spinoza!—and his grudging remarks on Egyptology and Assyriology. But at the close of the book he believes that Assyriology is to be the undoing of the literary criticism. "The spade, now so busy in Palestine, will undoubtedly, in the near future, unearth a copy of Genesis in cuneiform script, dating from the thirteenth or twelfth century B. C. By this one find all the theories of the 'Higher

¹ Nisbet & Co.

Critics' propounded in thousands of elaborate works will vanish from literary existence. . . . A copy of Genesis or Exodus in cuneiform script is (*sic*) the lie direct to all the theories of the 'Higher Critics' about the post-Mosaic, 'exilic' or post-exilic origin, i. e. fabrications of the Pentateuch. The lie direct; there can be no doubt about that, not even in the minds of the most benighted of 'Higher Critics' " (p. 186 sq.). A writer who has such confidence will of course liberally support the work of excavation in the East, and will doubtless rely upon the interpretations of those whose philology he condemns. But will he expect to find the book of Genesis complete?

His attitude towards literary evidence and the Pentateuch is astonishing. He gives it as a canon that "those makers of history who have left records have seldom done so with the disinterested motive of informing posterity of the truth" (p. 7). Subsequently, he states that the Pentateuch was written by Moses in the fourteenth or thirteenth century, whilst elsewhere we find that the Bible critics are confronted by a remarkable dilemma: (1) If the Pentateuch "is not or is not essentially a cento, then modern criticism is altogether wrong and futile"; but (2) if it be a cento, or patchwork we cannot go back as far as the real, the original authors, because we possess "a Pentateuch containing versions of compilations from compilations compiled from other compilations from authors, the very last ones of whom only, now long lost, were the original authors" (p. 69). It is scarcely necessary to remark that this is *not* the view of literary critics, and even Klostermann who has compared the Pentateuch to a *Gemeinde-Lesebuch* would hardly endorse a view stated in these terms (p. 67 sq.). Our readers may be able to judge from the foregoing whether Dr. Reich is in any way competent either "to destroy the spell of Higher Criticism," or even to construct the right method of comprehending the Bible—as he modestly attempts (p. vi), and it would be waste of space to deal further with a book whose tone is unpleasant, whose positive results are inconclusive, and whose chief value lies in some interesting remarks upon the Inquisition and upon Alien Immigration. Whether the readers of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*—whatever be their attitude towards literary criticism—would consent to the preposterous insinuation that the "Higher Criticism" has been influenced by anti-semitism (p. 174 sq.), it is at least certain that they would (in harmony with the "Higher Critics" themselves) refuse to agree with the extraordinary conclusions which Dr. Reich has reached regarding the antiquity of monotheism in Arabia (pp. 21-25)¹.

¹ It is possible that Dr. Reich in the course of his lectures became less convinced of the evidence from the Masai. There is no doubt that the

Whilst Dr. Reich came to the conclusion that literary criticism was bankrupt "after having learnt more about Life and Reality by means of extensive travels and varied experience"; a Jewish lawyer has turned to the Biblical problems in order to apply to them "the ordinary methods of legal study¹," and with a somewhat similar result. Like Dr. Emil Reich, Mr. Wiener has convinced himself of the futility and baselessness of the literary criticism, and, in his way, is as guilty of the same faults as the eminent historian to whose oratory we have referred. The "higher critics" do not fear hard knocks, but it is impossible at times to view with patience the exaggerated language, the abuse, and insinuation directed against the study by those who are unacquainted with the canons of good taste. "Word-peddling" and "date-mongering" are terms which Mr. Wiener may apply to critical methods if he so delights, but it is not too much to ask that sincerity and honesty be attributed, also, to those who use them. Mr. Wiener regrets that he has been compelled to resort to "ruthless intellectual weapons" (p. viii), but he has not used them. He has presented an *ex parte* statement, he has posed as a lawyer whose duty it is to conduct his client's case, not as an impartial judge, and his book has all the faults that specious pleading and the desire to overthrow an opponent's case can suggest.

To say that "an exhaustive and impartial scrutiny of evidence is—unless unintelligent word-counting be reckoned such—absolutely unknown" is as gross an error as can be imagined, and is only one of many indications that Mr. Wiener has approached his subject, not as an unprejudiced judge, but as the counsel for one side; not as one who is willing to treat the other party as innocent until he be proved otherwise, but as one who bolsters up a weak case by unscrupulous attack upon his opponent. It will be readily understood that "word-counting" and the like would give our author an unhappy impression, but he should understand that material of this kind is not intended for him, and although it is praiseworthy to examine one or two of the leading works connected with literary criticism, it would have been more to the point had he carefully perused an introductory

antiquity claimed for the African legends is impossible, and both Mr. A. C. Hollis (author of *The Masai: Language and Folklore*) and Mr. A. R. Stegall (*The Record*, Nov. 17, p. 1078) agree that the traditions in question are "merely the result of contact with Christian Missions during the last fifteen years." Their chief interest, accordingly, lies only in the fact that they show how foreign material is adapted to the environment of the borrowers.

¹ Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B. (Nutt, 1904); cp. his article on "The Jewish Attitude towards the Higher Criticism," in *The Churchman*, December, 1905.

handbook or two first. There are many investigations which the ordinary reader cannot be expected to appreciate, and to attack "word-counting" is as intelligent as to accuse archaeologists of devoting all their time to the classification of pottery patterns, and to deny to them an appreciation of the beautiful.

So far as I have examined Mr. Wiener's counter-arguments I cannot find that they are of much assistance. On p. 34 sq. he protests against the interpretation placed upon Exod. x. 21-23: that the Israelites "are living in the midst of the people in Egypt itself." Although he has quoted this from *The Oxford Hexateuch* and refers to its note on ch. vii. 8, he has failed to study that note attentively, else he would have perceived that it continues: "this latter view of their intermingling with the Egyptians lies at the basis of the instructions in iii. 21, and their sequel xi. 2."

Naturally, it is not the counsel for the plaintiff, but the judge who would be fair-minded enough to ask the "unprejudiced observer" to consider whether iii. 21, xi. 1 sqq., do or do not imply that Israel dwelt in the midst of the Egyptians, and whether other passages do not point to their residence apart in Goshen. Mr. Wiener's "unprejudiced observer" can see for himself whether Exod. xii. 13 indicates that they live in such close proximity with Egyptian neighbours that they must carefully distinguish their own houses so that Yahweh may pass over them. As it is, Mr. Wiener does not criticize the note in *The Oxford Hexateuch*, p. 80, where other instances of divergent views are presented, and if he chooses to single out one example and argue that Exod. x. 21-23 *does* refer to Israel in Goshen, it is obvious from the other passages that he must agree that there are traces of the composite origin of the narratives.

On turning over the pages, one is struck by his comment upon Deut. xxiv. 16. The injunction that fathers should not be put to death for the children, &c., is one over which, he observes, great obscurity hung until the code of Hammurabi was discovered, and he remarks:—"If such a practice had ever obtained in Israel, Moses and the prophets would have thundered against it in very different terms to these" (p. 114). He finds from the Babylonian code that the verse was actually aimed at a practice enforced by Babylonian law; and he believes that the prohibition was clearly intended as a safeguard against the possibility of its ever being introduced among the Israelites. But surely the law is not quite so obscure as he seems to imagine. The idea of personal responsibility was one of slow growth, and is strongly insisted upon even as late as Ezekiel's time. So, when it is emphasized that Amaziah did *not* put to death the children of the murderers of his father (2 Kings xiv. 6), it must be

acknowledged that in spite of absence of direct allusion to the custom, the practice must have been familiar. It is questionable whether there is any support for the assumption that Deut. aims at the Babylonian law, and it is important to bear in mind that the *tatio* as a general principle was common to both peoples¹.

Mr. Wiener does not succeed in placing before his readers very clearly his views of Deuteronomy. On p. 48 he protests in the usual way against "prophetic re-formulation," "modification," insisting that the critical theory of the date of the book implies that writers have been guilty of what is probably the most heinous offence of which a human being can be guilty. He is of course ignorant of oriental literary methods, and, possibly, has never compared Chronicles or Jubilees with the earlier books. But elsewhere it is found that "Deuteronomy was intended for public reading" (p. 108); and that in Deuteronomy "we look for . . . new laws rendered necessary by the disappearance of Moses, and such institutions as depended mainly or wholly on public opinion" (p. 109). More striking is his remark that "it may perhaps be said that the legal contents of Deuteronomy are determined by its popular character and by the altered circumstances of the time" (ib.). To what "altered circumstances" does Mr. Wiener refer? Of certain laws, he correctly observes that there was not much room for them whilst Moses was at the head of the Israelite organization and, as an example, he cites the establishment of a kingdom (xvii. 14-20), adding: "clearly there was no room for any other king in his lifetime (pp. 111 sq.)." So far from drawing any inference from this, he at once proceeds "so, too, with new law; if any difficulty arose, it was of course taken to Moses." It is quite uncertain whether he means that subsequent laws of post-Mosaic origin were ascribed to Moses, in which case, contrast his views upon "forgery," p. 48, or whether, simply, that the code of Deuteronomy grew up from an original kernel as every fresh difficulty arose. But immediately after this Mr. Wiener continues: "a similar remark applies to the provisions in xviii. 15-22 as to prophets. So long as Moses was alive, he would discriminate between true and false prophets." Upon what grounds does he distinguish between Mosaic and post-Mosaic laws, and how far has he considered the inherent probability that this mass of legislation (Exod.-Deut.) was given to a people who had not yet a settled habitation and a home? Mr. Wiener apparently employs some kind of criticism, but it is not that of the Old Testament critics.

Mr. Wiener's fundamental fault is his inability to realize primitive conditions and to comprehend the position of the Mosaic code as a unit in its relation to Israelite history. His intemperate and

¹ See the writer's *Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi*, p. 274, &c.

hasty judgments upon "higher critics" are, notwithstanding this, inexcusable, and are of a character to prejudice his book as a whole. The book has merits, and it is important to emphasize the necessity of considering carefully the sociological aspect, but it is unfortunate that he insists upon viewing the laws from the highly technical standpoint of modern jurisprudence. A better acquaintance with oriental custom and an appreciation for ancient thought are indispensable adjuncts to the modern critical spirit which Mr. Wiener's special training fosters. It should be added that the book is dedicated "To the memory of all who have lived or died for the Torah." This practically prevents criticism. One has the greatest respect for all that the sentiment involves and one is fully aware that the author is upholding the Torah in defence of those who have been martyrs for the faith. Similarly, Dr. Reich, by subtle ingenuity, denounces literary criticism as an attack upon Christianity. It is much to be desired that those who desire to attack critical studies and who desire criticism should refrain from confusing issues and should elaborate with more precision their own particular standpoint¹. It does not seem unnecessary to remind such writers as these of the words which were written by Robertson Smith, nearly a quarter of a century ago: "it is of the first importance that the reader should realize that Biblical criticism is not the invention of modern scholars but the legitimate interpretation of historical facts²."

The advent into the arena of Biblical studies of men from other fields is welcome provided only that they are well-equipped, and it is with great interest that we notice the work of a member of the Philadelphia bar who has published a discussion of the "leading cases" in the Bible³. "The Bible," writes Mr. Amram, "may or may not have been written in a manner different from other productions of the human understanding, but it is certain that it has value only if studied by the rational and critical method that is applied to all other historical documents and records." Now, the Bible has rarely been studied by lawyers, and whether or not this be (as the author suggests) because men who love freedom in thought and in expression have revolted from the influence of dogmatic religion, it is a hopeful

¹ Mr. Wiener is acquainted with the Code of Hammurabi and is aware of its parallels with the Mosaic legislation (p. 115 sq.), but, so far as I have noticed, he does not indicate to what extent (if at all) it bears upon the ordinary view of the Divine origin of the Pentateuchal laws through Moses.

² *The Old Test. in the Jewish Church*, first ed., 1881, Preface.

³ *Leading Cases in the Bible*, by D. W. Amram, M.A., LL.B., member of the Philadelphia Bar. (Philadelphia: J. H. Greenstone.)

sign that they should bring their own special studies to bear upon the literature of the Old Testament. "In these records," he observes, "many stages of civilization have left memorials of their painful progress in religion, in morals and in law," and whilst an appreciation of literary criticism helps to the better understanding of the growth of this progress it is essential that the principles of sociology and comparative custom should be enlisted in order that the study of the literary evidence and of the culture should go hand in hand. It is only by a cordial and tolerant co-operation that such a study can be pursued, and it ought to be possible to arrive at a common understanding regarding essential points. Mr. Amram utters a truism when he says that "the discretion necessary for the proper writing of history can never be realized . . . by the 'higher' critic, armed with knowledge of philology, but ignorant of economics and law," but upon what grounds does he base his remark? Is it that so many of the Old Testament critics are very properly Hebraists, or has he failed to realize that philology and textual criticism must lie at the bottom of every attempt to interpret ancient documents?

Recommending to our readers a careful perusal of the Introduction (pp. 1-18), as a useful antidote to Mr. Wiener's personal views, we may notice at random some of the more interesting points dealt with by the legal critic. As regards the judge and his court, emphasis is laid upon the primitive representation of the former in the story of Adam and Eve as contrasted with the highly developed picture in Job i. sq. where the court of Heaven is fashioned like that of a king, and affords an unpleasant picture of the prosecutor or inquisitor (Satan) which is scarcely Jewish. To the popular mind, the great judge is he whose methods are direct, swift and striking as in Solomon's judgment (p. 160). Despotism whether of the patriarchal chief, judge or king finds frequent illustration, although it is remarked that even in the case of Naboth's vineyard everything is done according to the strict form of the law: popular tradition and forms of procedure could not be violated even by a Jezebel (p. 172). As regards Solomon's treatment of Joab, the only legal justification is to be found in the fact that the latter had previously been guilty of wilful murder and therefore could not enjoy the benefit of sanctuary (p. 154 sq.). It may be remarked that Mr. Amram does not concern himself with the credibility of the narrative. He regards Adonijah as guilty of a fatal diplomatic blunder in asking for Abishag, recognizing quite correctly that the people would have seen in such a marriage a confirmation of his claims, but is it likely that one who was conversant with intrigue would so wilfully invite destruction? The death of Joab may find justification in Solomon's words, but the

murder of Abner and Amasa was an old offence and at this stage in Hebrew custom it would rest with the relatives of the murdered men to exact vengeance.

Examples of cross-examination are discussed in the stories of Adam and Eve, and Cain and Abel. Sales could be effected without witnesses and the oath was a sufficient guarantee (p. 60); thus, Esau recognized the validity of the sale of his birthright, and it was not until a later date that laws of general equity came into existence (Lev. xxv. 14). In the matter of Isaac's blessing, it is pointed out that intention was not essential; the formal act, however induced, was binding and irrevocable: "The notion that a formal act may be nullified on grounds of fraud or mistake is comparatively late in the history of jurisprudence." In the conflict between Cain the agriculturist and Abel the herdsman, a great sociological truth is recognized: the supplanting of pastoral groups by agriculturists (p. 36); whilst in the sale of Esau's birthright we are to see the growing superiority of the herdsman over the huntsman, and of the Israelites over the Edomites. Theft, as instanced in the story of Laban and Jacob, had to be proved by finding the stolen article in the possession of the thief, and the complainant had right of search and free access (p. 81)¹.

The same narrative illustrates the law of the shepherd, and shows how much harder the custom was than the laws (Exod. xxii. 10-13). Blasphemy among primitive peoples is an offence for the gods themselves to avenge, and in the story of Achan the guilty one is discovered by casting lots and (evidently an advance upon early ideas) a confession is extorted. In Judges vi (p. 92 sq.) Joash contends that Baal should plead his own cause, although with the transition from primitive conditions to the feeling of national consciousness, the citizens feel that an offence against their god is one affecting themselves. Offences against God and the king are illustrated in the story of Naboth and Ahab and in the trial of Jeremiah, and in the latter it is instructive to notice the importance laid upon precedents. As regards the conveyance of land, the simplicity of Gen. xxiii. 1-20 stands in marked contrast with Jer. xxxii. 6-15 which is clearly influenced by Babylonian usage; but primitive dealings are not in themselves any criterion for the date of the former, the usage in the book of Ruth is equally simple, and elementary forms of transacting business (the clasping of hands, &c.) persisted down to late times. Considerable emphasis is laid upon the inalienable character of land

¹ The latter statement finds an interesting illustration in Babylonian usage; see the present writer's *Laws of Moses, &c.*, p. 218.

and the topic is one that appears to deserve fuller treatment and upon more critical lines than those upon which Mr. Amram has proceeded.

Finally, the position of women is particularly instructive. Eve, after all, was merely an accessory in the story of the Fall; Adam was the only law-breaker and the serpent was at the most morally responsible (p. 25). But Eve's punishment was excessive from the legal point of view, and Mr. Amram finds in this an indication of the low status of women. Their subordinate position is indicated further in the story of Laban and Jacob, although there it is implied that the daughters ought to share in the father's estate. The father's authority over the married daughters is especially noticeable, as also is the circumstance that the father apparently had the right of taking the daughter from her husband. In the case of Jephthah's daughter, the power of the parent stands out clearly; he had sole authority, which in later days as the members of the family acquired a definite status was considerably curtailed. The unique narrative of Zelophehad's daughters is an example of "the reopening of the case upon the petition of the defendants." The institution of a fully established court is significant, and Mr. Amram ventures upon the suggestion that some traditional right of females to inherit may have persisted in the tribe of Manasseh. This is interesting, because it is very possible that east of the Jordan there were divergent customs; and, besides, the status of women may have varied in different communities. The whole subject of the family in ancient Israel is of intense interest, and Mr. Amram in his instructive essays raises questions which can hardly be discussed within the limits of a review.

This topic forms the motive of a study by R. Louis-Germain Lévy¹ who undertakes a careful investigation of the Old Testament evidence and recent literature. It is a careful piece of work marked by thoroughness and width of learning, and may be recommended for its comprehensive survey of the whole question. The author decides against totemism and ancestral worship, and finds that "le culte de la puissance fécondante et génératrice a joué un rôle de premier ordre dans les croyances des Hébreux" (p. 271). He concludes that there are no serious grounds in favour of an original matriarchy, and argues strongly in favour of the presence of patriarchy from the most remote period. Exogamy and endogamy coexist, but M. Lévy holds that the latter was the more usual. The evolution of the family appears in the various stages of blood-revenge, and—in the author's opinion—in the steady improvement of the status of women, and the growth of monogamy. Promiscuity comes under the

¹ *La Famille dans l'Antiquité Israélite* (Alcan, Paris).

ban of the law, and feelings of morality give the impulse to the ever increasingly strict legislation. Thus the family in ancient Israel improves in notions of right, equality and benevolence, and forms a school of respect, purity, and reciprocal devotion which unites the respective members of its generations (p. 276). Altogether, the Rabbi of Dijon's manual is a useful contribution to Hebrew sociology for the wealth of his material and the abundance of his resources. It is admittedly based upon the results of literary criticism, for, as the writer candidly admits :—

“On ne saurait se former une idée exacte du développement de la civilisation israélite, si l'on ignore ou l'on méconnaît la nature, l'origine, la composition, l'histoire des écrits bibliques qui constituent notre plus importante source d'information ” (p. 5).

It will doubtless be agreed that whatever may be the arguments of those who are opposed to literary criticism, it is rather significant that those who apply themselves to questions of scientific research in Old Testament subjects find themselves compelled to adopt the standpoint of “moderate criticism.”

The question of the family figures prominently in yet another book, this time only as far as external points of detail are concerned. In an elaborate and painstaking work B. Jacob¹ discusses the evidence in the Pentateuch regarding the arrangement of family and genealogical lists, and, extending his field, investigates the chronology, the narratives of the tabernacle, the festivals and the sacrifices. It would be quite impossible to do justice to this interesting book in the space at our disposal; it must suffice to state that Jacob's studies should be read carefully and with critical judgment, and if the results at which he has arrived stand the test of time, he is to be complimented upon a piece of constructive work which explains many intricate difficulties. To put it briefly, these studies are concerned with those portions of Old Testament tradition which critical opinion regards as unhistorical and seeking to discover the underlying principles, they aim at ascertaining the motives which influenced the tradition, and endeavour to explain the origin of details which have often been treated as the fruit of the imagination or as artificial invention. “Higher” and other critics have questioned the great age of Methuselah, but few (if any) have ever troubled to seek the origin of the number chosen; the results of the census-taking in the wilderness have been rejected, but no satisfactory explanation has been offered of the way in which the number of each tribe has been reached. And herein lies the value of Jacob's work, since it is obvious that

¹ *Der Pentateuch : exegetisch-kritische Forschungen* (Leipzig : Veit & Co.).

however unhistorical a tradition may be, it is important to know how it has risen, and to ascertain whether or no the explanation can be associated with other similar phenomena.

To take one of Jacob's conclusions. Many readers are aware of the extremely artificial appearance of many of the date-evidences in the Old Testament chronology. For example, it is 480 years from the Exodus to the founding of the Temple at Jerusalem, and it is also 480 years thence to the Return from the Exile. From a careful study of the Biblical tradition, Jacob finds that by working back 480 years before the Exodus he reaches the time of Peleg. Now, in Peleg's days "the earth was divided" (Gen. x. 25). Is this a mere play upon the name? Jacob prefers to see in it an allusion to the Tower of Babel, which was probably built, according to the tradition, 480 years before the temple of Solomon. This date would be A.M. 1974. Exactly half this number, or A.M. 987, turns out to be the year of Enoch's translation. Thus Jacob lays his finger upon a definite chronological scheme according to which man's first attempt to reach the heavens (Gen. xi. 4) occurred in A.M. 1974, 480 years later came the institution of the tabernacle, and after another 480 the founding of the temple at Jerusalem. Again, Adam died at the age of 930—the "thousand years" of the Psalmist (Ps. xc. 4) less the proverbial 70 (ib. ver. 10), and David's date (A.M. 2930) is exactly 2000 years later. The question then arises, when did this scheme originate? Here, the author observes that of the 480 years from Solomon to the Return, 50 are taken up with the Exile itself. In agreement with this, 50 years of the earlier period elapse between the building of the tower of Babel and Abraham's departure from Haran; the result is no mere coincidence. So far from believing that the *whole* chronology is artificial, Jacob thinks that the era actually started with Solomon's temple, and that the scheme has been worked backwards, with, of course, the obvious inference that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch becomes impossible (p. 127).

When he turns to the form of the genealogies he finds more specimens of artificial treatment. The enumerations of the tribal divisions according to the wives and concubines of the patriarchal ancestor are mere modelling, and Jacob certainly makes out a strong case for the "streng arithmetisch" scheme upon which they are based. In view of the numerous attempts which have been made to discover some rational explanation of the allotment of some of the tribes to the wives and of others to the concubines, his conclusion is important. He analyses carefully all the lists in the Pentateuch and notes, by the way, that the seventy Israelite clans (Gen. xlvii) begin with חנך and end with שלם! The favourite numbers are 12 and

70, whereas in the chronology 1000, 100, and 30 seem to have been in greatest demand¹. When he comes to the census of the Israelites (Num. i-iii, xxvi), he observes the same artificial principles at work and obtains a more consistent explanation of the numbers than that recently put forth by Prof. Petrie². The Egyptologist, after observing that Sinai could probably have held only some 4,000 to 7,000 people, examined the traditional numbers and discovered that (a) there was no exact thousand, (b) no 100, 800, or 900, and (c) more than half the hundreds fell on 400 or 500. He then noticed that the chances against such a result were more than a thousand to one and that there was evidently some strong selective influence on the hundreds apart from the thousands. Thence he concluded that the hundreds of the census-lists had an independent origin apart from the thousands, and that the word for *thousands* had been misunderstood, and meant *families*, so that Judah's 74,600, for example, was originally seventy-four families (amounting to) 600 persons. Without pursuing Prof. Petrie's speculations any further, we may refer readers to Jacob's argument that the numbers have been reached in accordance with principles which recur again and again. They are no mere isolated peculiarity, but, in his opinion, are in perfect harmony with methods which he abundantly illustrates. There is no example of 100, 800, or 900 simply because when the writers proposed to divide a given number into two they preferred neither to halve it exactly nor to give extremes. Hence, in the case of 10, for example, their result would usually be 6+4, 7+3; rarely 8+2 or 9+1. This is not the place to deal more fully with the rival explanations, neither of which pay enough attention to critical results, nor is it possible to ignore the fact that Jacob, though ingenious is uncritical, and notwithstanding the force of much of his evidence, has undoubtedly attempted to make his system too comprehensive.

The general conclusion at which Jacob arrives is that the traditions are unhistorical; it is not history but pure arithmetic which accounts for the present form of the genealogical and chronological details, and he is led to the inference that the comparatively simple system which he has discovered implies a literary unity which would be impossible were the writings the work of different authors. It will be admitted that this is a curious result: the purity of the Massoretic text is maintained, historical criticism is shown to be justified, whilst the literary criticism is held to be baseless. But Jacob's paradoxical deductions are not convincing, and one feels that here he has gone beyond his evidence. He points, for example, to the varying use of

¹ Whence $480 = 3 \times 130 + 3 \times 30$.

² *The Expositor*, Aug. 1905, pp. 148-152.

יָלֵךְ and הוֹלִיךְ (characteristic, according to "literary" criticism, of the Yahwist and Priestly Code respectively), and argues that both forms occur in narratives which are marked by his system, and cannot, therefore, belong to different authors. Notwithstanding this, Jacob's own explanation of the usage is significant, for he finds that הוֹלִיךְ is used in the statistical genealogies whereas יָלֵךְ is summary and less definite. The latter is employed in the collateral lines, whilst the former runs through the principal line of figures (Adam, Seth, Noah, &c.), whose history is the main theme of the book of Genesis (p. 62). This conclusion, it will be observed, ignores the possibility that the appearance of unity could be the result of the final redaction of the Pentateuch (or rather Hexateuch), and when the evidence is studied in the light of the rest of the Old Testament it becomes more probable that, although earlier writers occasionally were interested in recording genealogies, the fondness for statistical information attained its height during the exilic and the post-exilic period.

There is, further, another conclusion which, considering the circumstances, is very remarkable. Jacob believes that the tabernacle never existed in the wilderness in the form in which it is described in the Pentateuch. It is not a historically true picture but an ideal, and the aim of the writers was not to construct a picture of the most beautiful sanctuary that fancy could conceive, but to give expression to certain religious beliefs. The earthly tabernacle was only a copy of a heavenly original (cp. Exod. xxv. 9-40, xxvi. 30), and it is the result of a general system which (according to Jacob) pervades the genealogical and chronological methods, and underlies the details of cult and ritual. The "key" to the Pentateuch is the recognition of the fact that everything that is on earth has its prototype in heaven. The whole theory is thus summed up in a sentence (p. 404):

"Alles, was auf Erden geschehen ist, besteht und getan werden soll, unterliegt in Zahl und Mass sich ausprägenden Gesetzen, die schliesslich auf himmlische Ordnungen zurückgehen."

Those who have observed the trend of biblical criticism among a certain school of Old Testament critics will not fail to be struck by this conclusion. Jacob, relying upon the Hebrew tradition (the Old Testament, Mishna, &c.), has arrived at a cosmos-theory of the same character as that which has recently attained considerable prominence in the writings of Hugo Winckler. And it is also at least curious that Clermont-Ganneau, quite independently and innocently, found himself obliged to suggest a cosmological interpretation of an obscure Phoenician inscription found at Sidon within the last few years. The cosmos-theory in its present form may not be considered

attractive, but it will be patent, I think, that when three distinct lines of evidence appear to converge in such an unexpected manner, it must not be viewed as a mere individual fleeting phase of criticism, but as one that deserves more serious consideration¹.

Winckler's theory² has found several adherents in Germany, one of whom, Dr. Alfred Jeremias, is the author of two useful works on the Babylonian elements in the Bible³. In the larger of the two, the author publishes a series of studies on "das altorientalische Weltbild," the Babylonian Pantheon, Cosmologies, Paradise, Deluge-myths, Pre-Israelite Canaan, &c., with a number of more or less isolated glosses on passages upon which Assyriology throws helpful light. As a whole, it comes somewhere between Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* and the new edition of that work by Winckler and Zimmern. Without the philological wealth of the former and the abundance of technical matter of the latter, it is a somewhat popular, although extremely helpful production which fully deserves the subtitle it bears. It is one of the best of its kind that we have seen, it is judiciously illustrated, and should strengthen the reputation which its author already possesses in Assyriology. He has managed to incorporate a great deal of really valuable material in a concise form, and many will doubtless find this comparatively small book more practicable and intelligible than the latter of the works with which it has been compared. His slighter study on the New Testament is equally suggestive, and is not confined to that book alone. For the purpose of his argument he goes afield to Rabbinical lore, and incidentally succeeds in illustrating, in a most interesting way, the development of thought of the period. It is a singularly notable contribution to the New Testament age from a particular point of view, and is suggestive and stimulative throughout. The student of comparative religion cannot fail to be grateful to Dr. Jeremias for the evidence he has collected.

¹ B. Jacob observes in the preface (p. iv): "In dieser formalen Ausprägung wird man eine gewisse Verwandtschaft mit der 'Weltanschauung' erkennen, die besonders H. Winckler mit Nachdruck für Babylonien, alsdann aber auch für die ganze alte Welt in Anspruch nimmt: die Anschauung, dass alles Irdische ein Abbild vom Himmlischen ist und sein soll. Indessen habe ich mir alle Vergleichenungen bis auf wenige Ausblicke grundsätzlich versagt, weil zunächst noch genug zu tun ist, erst einmal den Pentateuch an sich selbst zu verstehen."

² For an account of it in English, reference may be made to his article "Sinai and Horeb" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. IV.

³ *Das Alte Testament im Licht des alten Orients—Handbuch zur biblisch-orientalischen Altertumskunde*. (Leipzig, 1904). *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig, 1905).

It is impossible not to feel that a powerful tendency is at work which is lifting the study of the Bible out of the somewhat narrow grooves in which it has been pursued. The research of the last few decades has shown that Palestine was no oasis in the desert of the ancient world, and that its inhabitants can no longer occupy the isolated position which they once seemed to hold. Excavation and the monuments have revealed to a remarkable extent the height of the civilization which at one period or another its neighbours reached. To understand our Bible aright it is not enough to know its language, it is not even enough to seek to know its people; we must ascertain the influences by which it was surrounded, and endeavour to calculate each stage of contemporary human development. At present, as every one is aware, comparatively little has been done in research among the "tells" of Palestine, and as the years advance, this will become increasingly difficult. There is still a fine field for study among the present natives, but as their old-world ways die out through contact with modern life, the chance of recovering a record of their thought becomes less. But with all this, the literary records survive and will neither diminish nor increase, and since these constitute, as it were, the letterpress to the illustrations of archaeology, there is more urgent need for the consistent application of critical methods throughout. Obviously a study which is concerned with the fruit of human thought is intensely complicated, and it is only by a liberal recognition of the importance of kindred studies that one may hope to make advances in the future. Disconcerting though the entrance of experts from other fields into Biblical study may sometimes appear, it should be recognized that the Bible has other than purely theological interests and appeals to others than theologians.

For the present purpose, it is sufficient to indicate the very increased interest which is taken in the Old Testament from the Assyriological point of view, and although this is not the place to deal at length with the particular tendency to which reference has already been made, some remarks of a purely provisional nature may perhaps be allowed. The question, it must be noticed, will become ever more critical as fresh points of relation between Old Testament and Babylonian thought are admitted. On archaeological grounds, it would probably be considered that Babylonian influence in Palestine has been proved by the evidence of the Amarna Tablets, &c., and, if Jacob's theory were accepted in its entirety, it might be maintained—also on archaeological grounds—that literary criticism was shipwrecked and the hypothesis of post-exilic literary activity overthrown. Such statements would have to be treated with the greatest caution,

and, to judge from the experience of the past, the legitimacy of the inferences from the evidence would need careful consideration. It is a common mistake at the present day to make a false application of correct principles, to build unsound arguments upon perfectly sound facts, and it would be necessary, therefore, to guard against a repetition of the same faults. There are certain results of literary criticism which no archaeological or monumental discovery could disprove.

One of the most obvious objections to the cosmological theory that at once suggests itself is the fact that, viewed from Jacob's standpoint, it breaks the continuity of the development of thought in ancient Israel. The belief that the earthly temple was only a copy of a heavenly one, as also the entire system of which this forms only part, Jacob regards as early, whereas a consideration of his arguments from the literary-critical standpoint would lead to the inference that the whole is, in its present form, post-exilic. And if it is admitted that the cosmos-theory in some form or other influenced Israel at this later period, it is a perfectly natural step thence to the fundamental view that underlies the Book of Jubilees. The tendency of this book is to give expression to the view that, just as the tabernacle had its heavenly prototype, so "the various elements of the law, which were established in the course of tradition, were likewise copies of divine originals engraven on the heavenly tables¹." It seems to follow, therefore, that any critical consideration of the cosmos-theory must take into account the subsequent development of Jewish thought outside the Old Testament, with the object of determining whether the general trend of the evidence presupposes an early—or what appears more natural—a late date for its spread in Israel. Further, the source of the system being Babylonian, it is obvious that apart from the Old Testament evidence there is much that must first be assured from the Assyriological side, in particular the dates of the tablets which appear to support the new theory. And, finally, one may express one's distrust of all comprehensive systems which are claimed, or which, viewed superficially, appear to be keys to the understanding of the Old Testament. Systems of historical interpretation are as fallacious and one-sided as systems of history-writings, they are exaggerated and obscure the broader issues, and have their chief value in the fact that by viewing history in a special light they may succeed in elucidating a series of hitherto unintelligible facts. Each "key" shows us one way, often an isolated, impossible or unattractive way; what is wanted is the all-round view, in perspective, which takes in everything with a due proportion.

¹ R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, p. xlix.

So far as the Old Testament is concerned, the object of criticism is to do for the history of Israel what Lorenzo Valla, Glareanus, Pouilly, Niebuhr and a host of others have done for the history of Greece and Rome. By the application of scientific principles of historical research, such as are elsewhere employed, the aim must be to construct a "moderate" platform upon which Biblical students can meet. In so far as this criticism has not commanded unanimous assent, the study in its broader aspects is still in the pioneering stage, and, quite apart from theological considerations, may long continue in this stage, owing to the character of the field and to the many difficulties of the subject. For this object, for the attainment of truth, one cannot too much emphasize the fact that the wider the horizon of the Biblical student the better may he hope to view his subject in a true perspective, and the more real will be his comprehension of the progress of history. As Niebuhr has well put it: "history is, of all kinds of knowledge, the one which tends most decidedly to produce belief in Providence¹."

Among the pioneer studies which all students, whether of the Old Testament, of ancient history, or of archaeology, must follow with keenness, Assyriology occupies the foremost place, and two works call for notice in the present article. The reproach has sometimes been made that the critics of the Old Testament have not given sufficient heed to Assyriological claims, and, if the accusation be true, it can be answered. For Assyriology has only recently "come of age," and critics accustomed to subject their evidence to the most rigorous scrutiny have had good reason for regarding some of its results in the past with caution. Much harm has been done by the hasty publication of evidence interesting to the Biblical student, and even more mischief has been caused by the unscientific use of its results, by illegitimate inferences and by uncritical arguments. To this the present writer hopes to return elsewhere. But it is a pleasure to mark the really sound progress which is now being made in the study as a whole, and to express the hope that there may be found Jewish students willing to enter a field of research which has a peculiar interest for those trained in Talmudic studies².

It is not too late to refer to Prof. Jensen's comprehensive volume on Assyrian and Babylonian myths and epics which appeared in

¹ The citation is taken from Prof. Flint's *History of the Philosophy of History*, p. 226.

² Hermann Pick, *Assyrisches und Talmudisches* (Berlin, 1903) is an example of what can be done upon a much neglected field. Cp. F. Perles, "Babylonian and Talmudic Glosses," *Orient. Lit.-Zeit.*, Aug. and Sept., 1905.

Schrader's Library of Cuneiform Inscriptions¹. Five years have elapsed since its publication, and a second volume, on the religious texts, is eagerly awaited from the pen of the great Assyriologist. It forms the most characteristic and notable contribution in Schrader's ever invaluable series, and by its painstaking accuracy and brilliancy of method has been an immense boon to linguistic research in this particular field. The "Assyrian Library" itself, like its editor's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, has had a very great share in increasing the intelligent interest awakened by the more sensational episodes, e.g. the discovery of a Deluge-legend or a Creation-myth, and by printing the text in transliteration by the side of the translation made it possible for Semitic students to obtain some acquaintance with the newly recovered language. The historical, legal, and commercial inscriptions which appear in the first five volumes have their own value, although the general progress in Assyriology has already made it necessary to treat their translation with some circumspection. The present volume is in many respects the most important of all, since it brings us more closely to the minds of the people. It contains nearly 600 pages, of which no fewer than 288 are taken up with critical notes upon the texts. The latter comprise such well-known myths as the Creation-myths, the Gilgameš (Nimrod) epic, the descent of Ištar into Hades, the story of Adapa and the south wind, and the Etana myths; among those which are perhaps less familiar are the myths of Zu, and of Nergal and Ereškigal. The bearing of some of these upon the Old Testament is already known to most readers; the suggestions that the wise Ethan is identical with Etana, or that the story of Job was derived from that of the Babylonian hero Ea-bani, may be cited as instances of the stimulus to Biblical study which this class of literature has afforded. As specimens of ancient Babylonian lore they necessarily interest a wider circle of students, and one is indebted to Prof. Jensen for the new translation backed up as it is by an exceptionally complete commentary.

The notes are exceptionally elaborate and form a philological commentary upon the text. Many of them are valuable for Aramaic or Hebrew, and not a few are of more general interest, e.g. geographical (p. 382 sq.), archaeological (pp. 372 sq., 400 sq.), &c. Among the more suggestive are Prof. Jensen's notes on the contents and aim of the Gilgameš epic, wherein he compares the journey of the Babylonian with the travels of Odysseus. Reference may be made to the comparison between the "host of Anu" (a star) and the Hebrew title

¹ *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, vi. I. "Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen" (Reuther & Reichard, Berlin).

יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת; the stars, according to old Hebrew belief, were warriors (p. 431). In another place he throws light upon the tradition of the Tree of Life (p. 441 sq., see p. 573). Again, he brings into association with Babylonia the connexion between the *Sabitu* and the Sibyl Σαμβήθη, which Zimmern had already noticed¹. Apropos of the Babylonian ark, he draws attention to the tablet discussed by Mr. Johns (*Assyrian Deeds*, II, no. 777), wherein are given its measurements and the names of the animals which Ut(= Ūm?)-naphištīm took in with him (pp. 487, 491 sq.). Perhaps the most interesting of all the many valuable details hidden in these learned notes—a full index is earnestly required—is the suggested identification of the name of Abdi-kheba with עֲבֶרְיָהוּ (p. 578). That a fifteenth-century king of Jerusalem, with whom the Amarna Tablets have made us so familiar, should have borne a name which pointed him out as the “servant of Yahweh” is extremely novel. On the other hand, Prof. W. M. Müller would recognize in *Ba-ti-ya* (List of Thotmes III, no. 97) a “house of Yah[weh],” and one may venture to doubt whether the Divine name would have been thus varyingly rendered. Abi-milkhi of Tyre, in one of the Amarna letters, writes “if my lord, the king, says to me ‘Be (*ku-na*, i. e. כֹּן) at the disposal of my deputy,’ the servant says to his lord ‘I will’ (*ia-a-ia-ia*, i. e. אֵיהֵא).” One would imagine from this that a more obvious transcription of Yahweh than *khība* could have been found by the scribe².

Prof. Jensen's work incorporates all that can be said upon the interpretation of the inscriptions which he translates, and he has expressed himself throughout with caution and reserve. By the discovery and publication of fresh texts there is always the hope in Assyriology, more than in most studies, that the future may dispel the obscurities of the present, and scarcely a month passes that does not see the record of some fresh advance. The linguistic problems must still continue to occupy the premier place, although fortunately there are many important texts where the practical unanimity of the Assyriologists is a guarantee that they can safely be used for religion, history, and sociology. Of the utility of special monographs, the *Leipziger Semitische Studien* afford excellent examples. J. Hunger's discussion of Babylonian hydromancy and S. Daiches' Old Babylonian

¹ Jensen, p. 470; this is associated with the parallels between the epic and the voyage of Odysseus; cp. pp. 507, 576, 579.

² Prof. Sayce has argued that *khība* is the “Hittite” deity, and it might be conjectured that *khība* was the “Hittite” way of spelling יהוה. A glance at the character of the Canaanite glosses (nos. 179-181), however, makes this extremely unlikely; where necessary the scribe could reproduce “Canaanitisms” with comparative faithfulness.

legal documents of the Hammurabi dynasty are valuable contributions each in its special department, and the latter in particular has brought welcome evidence to bear upon the interpretation of Hammurabi's now famous code of laws. Josef Böllenrücher's *Gebete und Hymnen an Nergal* exemplifies the type of study invaluable for the reconstruction of Babylonian religion, and since Nergal was associated with Kuthah, whose inhabitants Sargon settled in Samaria (722 B. C.), the pamphlet is far from being without Old Testament interest. The inscriptions reveal the god's numerous and diverse attributes: he is the god of the burning sun and fever, the ruler of Sheol, patron of the battle and the chase, Mars was sacred to him, and in one form or another he incorporated the Moon and the Zodiacal Twins. His association with the under-world is regarded as having arisen from the circumstance that near Kuthah was the necropolis of Babylonia¹. The hymns which are brought together and elucidated illustrate the character of the god and raise several interesting mythological problems, and needless to say, immediately myths or any other product of human thought come into consideration the study of comparative custom claims a hearing.

We approach a comprehensive subject, one, however, with which the Old Testament student must be in touch. One cannot neglect the evidence of anthropology, the accumulating evidence of the cults, myths, and ritual of the human race which frequently illustrate or even explain obscure allusions in Hebrew literature. The comparative method has the merit of suggesting the explanation of the rise or the progress of forms of thought, and if due care be exercised it is legitimate to associate for this purpose the most widely severed races. The parallels or analogies which frequently prove so helpful are far from being necessarily due to a relationship or connexion in historical or prehistoric times, but arise from the identity in the mental construction in the individual. One is forced to recognize that the human mind, like the external world, is in subjection to inflexible laws, and continued research has shown that there is a striking similarity in the structural development of precisely those phenomena which man imagines himself most easily able to control. It has been forcibly stated, and there is truth in the observation, "we do not think, thinking merely goes on within us."

But this is a study where similar conditions *may* give birth to different results, and where similar features *can* arise from dissimilar causes; the phenomena are complex, and speculative generalization seems premature. When handled with caution the evidence may

¹ That later views identified him with the cock (*Sanhed.*, 63 b) is in agreement with Nergal's solar and chthonic character.

enable us to arrange facts in their proper order, they can scarcely under any circumstance be used as "keys" to the history of the past. The student of the Old Testament is aware of the use which has been made of folklore, but it may safely be said that at present it does not seem justifiable to assume that extent of mythic element in the ancient literature which has commended itself to some writers. One may readily believe that the ancient Oriental unconsciously employed the language of myth, and that the stories of his heroes were wrapped in a clothing of legendary origin, but to attempt to sever genuine history from romance by the aid of folklore is a task of great delicacy, taking into account the comparatively meagre amount of our literary evidence and the primitive methods of Oriental writers.

We can heartily commend to those who would know something of the newer school of anthropological research and of its utility in Oriental study, M. Salomon Reinach's *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*¹. Every page is marked by his versatility; he is always stimulating even when least convincing, and his vivacity charms even when his arguments fail to appeal. He passes easily from discussions of totemism and exogamy to the domestication of animals, from the theory of sacrifice to "pieds pudiques"; from Druidism to the prohibition of incest, and from ritual flagellation back to the Druids; Gallic gods, old Celtic paganism, prayers for the dead, Samuel Zarza, Antoinette Bourignon, and a medley of other subjects illustrate the wide field upon which he is at home, and the diverse topics upon which his graceful pen sheds light. Nearly all the five-and-thirty essays have appeared elsewhere as reviews or articles; several are lectures: one, on Taroos Trigaranus, is new. It is not easy to make a selection where the whole is readable, it is a book which it is a pleasure to dip into from time to time, and one will look forward to the other volumes which are promised. In "Observations on the Taboo," M. Reinach pithily sums up its essential characteristics: it is a prohibition for which no reason is given; the punishment which is called down is not an obvious one; and it is a sacred and not a human being who is affected by the infraction of the law. M. Reinach observes that the ark was essentially a "Taboo" of the old Hebrews (pp. 3 sq.). There is much in this volume on totemism and one is glad to see reprinted the code of totemism (*Revue Scientifique*, Oct. 1900) to which reference has been made previously in these pages². Apropos of this topic, we may note his enunciation of the fundamental principle that primitive and savage races present a living picture of what the ancestors of civilized races may have been at some prehistoric period, and that we may find among the

¹ Leroux, Paris.

² *J. Q. R.*, 1902, April, p. 445.

more advanced peoples the survival of some primitive usage or idea which, in a more complete form, and in its proper environment, still exists in less frequented parts of the globe.

In the "Domestication of Animals," reference must certainly be made to his remarks upon the Old Testament conception of primitive man and his relations with the animal world (p. 86 sq.). The Hebrew historians had their own ideas of the evolution of civilization, and, so far, the early chapters of Genesis give a faithful picture of Hebrew belief; but no one at the present day can maintain that these are accurate accounts of the beginnings of all things, and all the attempts which have been made to reconcile science with the Old Testament narrative have been unsound. M. Reinach parenthetically observes that throughout the Middle Ages down to our own day Biblical authority—which it was dangerous to contest—turned aside scholars from the studies which concern the origin of civilization: that it also hindered freer study of the Bible itself needs no telling, those who have read carefully any history of the philosophy of history are aware of the slow and painful steps by which modern research in the study of the past has been built up. Finally, in his discussion of the "Theory of Sacrifice," M. Reinach criticizes two prevailing views, the one that it is a gift-sacrifice, the other that it is an obscure mystic ceremony by means of which the worshipper entered into communion with his god. The latter, the view of Robertson Smith, is the one he upholds (pp. 97-104), and he considers that the evidence from the Aruntas of South Australia¹, has led to too hasty a reaction among anthropologists against the totem-theory of sacrifice. It should be added that the volume is dedicated to the memory of Robertson Smith, and appropriately, for M. Reinach has been practically the only exponent in France of the work of one whose studies both in Old Testament criticism and in Semitic sociology and religion were a unique combination of Oriental scholarship and anthropological skill.

S. A. COOK.

¹ Dr. Frazer's remarks in *J. Q. R.*, 1902, pp. 439 sq. should be noticed.